02-CR-00260-PET

i

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TILED - ENTERED - RECEIVED

JAN - 8 2004

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON IRT DIFFERENCE OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff.

NO. CR02-260P

٧.

- }

PLEA AGREEMENT

ALFONSO D. LACSON, JR.,

Defendant.

The United States of America, by and through John McKay, United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington, and Jeffrey B. Coopersmith, Richard E. Cohen, and Ye-Ting Woo, Assistant United States Attorneys for said District, and Todd Brilliant, Special Assistant United States Attorney for said district, and the Defendant, ALFONSO D. LACSON, JR., and his attorney, Kristine Costello, enter into the following Agreement, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c):

- 1. <u>Waiver of Indictment</u>. Defendant, having been advised of the right to be charged by Indictment, agrees to waive that right and enter a plea of guilty to the charge brought by the United States Attorney in a Superseding Information.
- 2. <u>The Charges</u>. Defendant, having been advised of the right to have this matter tried before a jury, agrees to waive that right and enter a plea of guilty to the one-count Superseding Information, which charges Securities Fraud, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 77q(a) and 77x.

By entering these pleas of guilty, Defendant hereby waives all objections to the form of the charging document.

3. <u>Elements of the Offenses</u>. The elements of the offense of Securities
Fraud, as charged in the Superseding Information, in violation of Title 15, United States
Code, Sections 77q(a) and 77x, are as follows: (1) in the offer or sale of securities
Defendant employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; obtained money or property
by means of untrue statements of material facts or failure to state material facts which
made what was said, under the circumstances, misleading; or engaged in a transaction,
practice, or course of business that operated, or would operate, as a fraud or deceit upon a
purchaser; (2) Defendant acted willfully, knowingly, and with the intent to defraud; and
(3) Defendant used, or caused to be used, any means or instruments of transportation or
communication in interstate commerce or the mails in furtherance of the scheme.

4. The Penalties. Defendant understands that the maximum statutory penalties for the offense of Securities Fraud, as charged in the Superseding Information, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 77q(a) and 77x, are as follows: imprisonment for up to five (5) years, a fine of up to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00), a period of supervision following release from prison of between two (2) and three (3) years, and a one hundred dollar (\$100.00) penalty assessment.

Defendant further understands that the Court may impose an alternative fine of up to twice the pecuniary gain or loss.

Defendant agrees that the penalty assessment of \$100 shall be paid at or before the time of sentencing.

Defendant agrees that any monetary penalty the Court imposes, including the penalty assessment, fine, costs or restitution, is due and payable immediately, and further agrees to submit a completed Financial Statement of Debtor form as requested by the United States Attorney's Office.

Defendant understands that supervised release is a period of time following imprisonment during which he will be subject to certain restrictions and requirements. Defendant further understands that if supervised release is imposed and he violates one or more of its conditions, he could be returned to prison for all or part of the term of

- d. The Court is not bound by any recommendation regarding the sentence to be imposed, or by any calculation or estimation of the Sentencing Guidelines range offered by the parties, or by the United States Probation Department; and
- e. Defendant may not withdraw a guilty plea solely because of the sentence imposed by the Court.
- 7. <u>Ultimate Sentence</u>. Defendant acknowledges that no one has promised or guaranteed what sentence the Court will impose.
- 8. <u>Loss Amount</u>. The United States agrees that the loss amount for purposes of applying U.S.S.G. § 2F1.1(b)(1) (Nov. 2000) is not greater than eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000.00). The United States acknowledges that the Defendant reserves the right to argue for any loss amount that he believes is supported by the evidence.
- 9. Restitution. Defendant shall pay and agrees to pay restitution to the Receiver appointed by the Court in Securities and Exchange Commission v. Health Maintenance Centers, Inc., et. al., C02-153P (W.D. Wa.), in the amount determined by the Court at sentencing, with credit for any amounts already paid or collected, for distribution by the Receiver to those persons classified as investors. In the event that the Receivership terminates prior to Defendant's full payment of restitution in the amount ordered by the Court, the Defendant shall pay and agrees to pay restitution to those persons classified as investors in the Court's final distribution order in Securities and Exchange Commission v. Health Maintenance Centers, Inc., et. al., C02-153P (W.D. Wa.).

The government agrees that the appropriate restitution amount in this case should not exceed eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000.00). The United States acknowledges that the Defendant reserves the right to argue for any restitution amount that he believes is supported by the evidence.

All restitution ordered by the Court shall be due and payable immediately, and shall be paid in accordance with a schedule of payments as ordered by the Court.

- 10. <u>Statement of Facts</u>. The parties agree on the following facts in support of Defendant's guilty plea and for purposes of calculating the base offense level of the Sentencing Guidelines. Defendant admits he is guilty of the charged offense.
- a. Health Maintenance Centers, Inc. ("HMC") was incorporated in Washington State on or about May 12, 1995. Project X, Inc., was incorporated in the State of Washington on November 3, 1999. On October 3, 2000, Project X filed Articles of Amendment with the Washington State Secretary of State changing its name to Znetix, Inc. At no time were the securities issued by HMC and Znetix registered with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, the State of Washington's Department of Financial Institutions -- Securities Division ("DFI"), or the securities regulatory authorities in any other state.
- b. From no later than July 12, 2000, to on or about September 4,
 2001, the Defendant was an employee of HMC.
- c. On April 9, 2001, the DFI issued a Summary Order to Cease and Desist against Kevin L. Lawrence, the founder and principal officer of HMC and Znetix, and against HMC, including HMC's employees and agents. The Summary Order to Cease and Desist barred Lawrence and HMC (including its agents and employees) from selling securities through fraudulent means or in violation of securities registration requirements.
- d. Defendant was an employee and/or agent of HMC, and he knew by at least April 27, 2001, that the DFI had issued the Summary Order to Cease and Desist against Kevin L. Lawrence and HMC. The issuance of the Summary Order to Cease and Desist by the DFI constituted a material fact that would be necessary to disclose to any investors who purchased the securities of HMC and/or affiliated companies after such issuance. The Defendant did not disclose the material fact that

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

the DFI had issued the Summary Order to Cease and Desist to investors who purchased the securities of HMC and affiliated companies after it was issued.

- On or about May 9, 2001, an investor from Snyder, Texas with the initials "M.R." made an interstate telephone call to Defendant ALFONSO D. LACSON. In March of 2001, M.R. had previously purchased HMC securities from the Defendant. During the interstate telephone call on or about May 9, 2001, M.R. told the Defendant that he was interested in making an additional purchase of HMC securities in the amount of \$2,500. The Defendant sold \$2,500 worth of HMC securities to M.R., but intentionally and willfully failed to disclose to M.R. and omitted the material fact that the DFI had issued the Summary Order to Cease and Desist. Disclosure of the material fact that the DFI had issued the Summary Order to Cease and Desist was necessary to make the statements made by the Defendant, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading.
- f. Based on the Defendant's conversation with M.R. described above, on or about May 9, 2001, M.R. sent check number 1954 in the amount of \$2,500, drawn on his account at Snyder National Bank, from Snyder, Texas, to the Defendant in Kirkland, Washington. On or about May 21, 2001, the Defendant deposited the check he received from M.R. to bank account number 065-6228756 at Wells Fargo Bank, which was an account in the Defendant's name and under his signature authority.
- Dismissal of Counts and Non-Prosecution Agreement. In exchange for 11. the Defendant's pleas of guilty, and conditioned upon Defendant's fulfillment of all conditions of this Plea Agreement, the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington will, at the time of sentencing, move to dismiss all counts of the Second Superseding Indictment against Defendant ALFONSO D. LACSON, JR. Defendant agrees and acknowledges that any charges to be dismissed before or at the time of sentencing were substantially justified in light of the evidence available to the United States, were not vexatious, frivolous or taken in bad faith, and do not provide Defendant

2 | 119
3 |
4 | Def
5 | Atto
6 | Def
7 | hav
8 | Agr
9 | regs
10 | the
11 | bec
12 | ack
13 | Rep

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

Also in exchange for the Defendant's plea of guilty, and conditioned upon Defendant's fulfillment of all conditions of this Plea Agreement, the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington agrees not to prosecute Defendant for any other offenses, other than crimes of violence, that Defendant may have committed in the Western District of Washington prior to the date of this Agreement about which the United States presently possesses information. In this regard, Defendant recognizes that the United States has agreed not to prosecute all of the criminal charges that the evidence establishes were committed by Defendant solely because of the promises made by Defendant in this Agreement. Defendant acknowledges and agrees, however, that for purposes of preparing the Presentence Report, the United States Attorney's Office will provide the United States Probation Office with evidence of all relevant conduct committed by Defendant.

- 12. <u>Non-Prosecution of Other Individuals</u>. In exchange for the Defendant's pleas of guilty, and conditioned upon Defendant's fulfillment of all conditions of this Plea Agreement, the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington agrees that it will not criminally prosecute the Defendant's mother, Soledad Lacson, and the Defendant's brother, Anthony (Tony) Lacson, for any criminal offenses: (1) that are based upon evidence in its possession at this time, (2) that arise out of the investigation concerning the activities of persons associated with Znetix, HMC, and affiliated companies, and (3) for which there is venue in the Western District of Washington. This agreement does not apply to any crimes of violence.
- 13. <u>Voluntariness of Plea</u>. Defendant acknowledges that he has entered into this Plea Agreement freely and voluntarily, and that no threats or promises, other than the promises contained in this Plea Agreement, were made to induce Defendant to enter these pleas of guilty.

Agreement apply only to conduct that occurred prior to the execution of this Agreement. If, after the date of this Agreement, Defendant should engage in conduct that would warrant an increase in Defendant's adjusted offense level or justify an upward departure under the Sentencing Guidelines (examples of which include, but are not limited to: obstruction of justice, failure to appear for a court proceeding, criminal conduct while pending sentencing, and false statements to law enforcement agents, the probation officer or Court), the United States is free under this Agreement to seek a sentencing enhancement or upward departure based on that conduct.

17 | // 18 | //

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 /